

### **Remarks/Arguments**

Claims 1-15 are pending.

Indication of allowability of claims 5-7 is appreciated.

According to the Office Action, claims 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over US Publication 2003/0020413 (“Oomura”) in view of European Patent EP1221686 (“Pae”).

Applicant respectfully disagrees that the combination of references teaches or even suggests each and every feature recited in claim 12, from which claims 13-14 depend.

Applicant’s claim 12 includes, in part, the features of:

applying a voltage to the drive transistor to drive a current through the display element, the current being drawn from a current-measurement supply line;  
Emphasis added.

In the Office action it is argued that Oomura teaches the features of applying a voltage to the drive transistor to drive a current through the display element, the current being drawn from a current-measurement supply line, in Fig. 6 (see Office action pages 2 and 3 and “Response to Arguments” page 9).

However, a review of Oomura shows that at least the above claimed features are not shown or even suggested in Oomura. For example, the Office action equates applicant’s claimed current from a power supply line as to Fig. 6 (VDD) (see OA page 3). But the Office action does not point out where the current being drawn from a current-measurement supply line is shown or suggested in Oomura. From a review of Oomura, Fig. 6 and related discussion, the only current supplied to the OLED in Oomura is from the VDD through the drive transistor T1. In fact Oomura fails to teach or even suggest applicant’s claimed features.

Oomura, paragraphs 88-93, make clear that the structure shown in this embodiment provides that the driving current-voltage converter of the T3 and the second voltage control current source of the T4 are formed in a current mirror structure [P. 88].

Paragraph 93 describes the operation which shows that the T1 provides the driving current to the OLED from VDD in accordance with a gate voltage. The second voltage control current source of the T4 generates the current  $I_m$  (monitor current) correlating with the drive current. T3 and T4 perform the mirror operation. The monitor current  $I_m$  is added to the reference current source  $I_d$  in the data side drive circuit provided outside the pixel region, which

provides a control to the gate voltage of the T1, such that the gate voltage becomes equal to a voltage of the reference voltage source Vr.

There is no description or suggestion of applying a voltage to the drive transistor to drive a current through the display element, the current being drawn from a current-measurement supply line, as particularly recited in claim 12.

Furthermore, Pae fails to show at least the above mentioned features. In Pae columns 5 and 6 and Figs. 2-4 it is clear that the feedback proposed in Pae has no relation at all to a current through the display element. Pae in combination with Oomura fails to provide any suggestion to one skilled in the art of applicant's claimed features.

Pae shows the deviation compensator 20 detects the current from the drive transistor PO, while P2 is turned off. As described in Pae, paragraphs 0044-0052, when P2 is turned off and P3 is on, deviation compensator 20 detects the driving current of P0 by the transistor P3. Since P2 is off and P3 is on the current is not through the display element. In contrast, applicant's claimed invention recites that the current processed by feedback control circuitry is current through the display element.

Paragraphs 0039, 0052 and 0053 of Pae describe that P0 is connected to the emitting pixel OEL by the transistor P2 and the emitting pixel OEL is emitting light when P1 and P2 are turned on and the transistor P3 is turned off. Again, when P3 is turned on the current is not through the emitting pixel OEL. Therefore, Pae's proposed feedback loop is completely different from the claimed invention.

Consequently, even if the two references are combined (Applicant's representative does not concede that Oomura and Pae are combinable, but simply states the above for the sake of argument), the combination would still fail to teach or suggest all of applicant's claimed features.

At least for the above reasons, Applicant submits that the rejection of claim 12 has been overcome and can no longer be sustained. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claim. Dependent claims 13-14 include at least the above mentioned distinguishing features, plus additional features, and are likewise patentable.

According to the Office Action, claims 1-4, 8-11 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Oomura, in view of Miyazawa (2004/0036664).

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of references fails to teach or even suggest the features in claim 1 including in part: a second switch for routing current from a current-measurement supply line to the display element, ... wherein a feedback system is provided between the current-measurement supply line and the control line. Emphasis added.

According to applicant's claim 1 the current is routed from the current measurement supply line to the display element. In contrast, and as pointed out above, Oomura fails to teach or even suggest such a feature. Oomura relies upon a current mirroring scheme and does not suggest a second switch for routing current from a current-measurement supply line to the display element.

The Office action points to T5, however Oomura clearly teaches that T5 controls the monitor current from T4 to Im. There is nothing that suggests that T5 routes current from a current-measurement supply line to the display element.

As a result, the combination of Oomura and Miyazawa fails to teach or suggest all the elements of claim 1. Consequently, even if the references are combined (Applicant's representative does not concede that Oomura and Miyazawa are combinable, but simply states the above for the sake of argument), the combination would still fail to teach or suggest all of applicant's claimed features.

At least for the above reasons, Applicant submits that the rejection of claim 1 has been overcome and can no longer be sustained. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claim.

Claims 2-4, 8-11 and 15 depend from independent claims, which have been shown to be allowable over the references. Accordingly, claims 2-4, 8-11 and 15 are also allowable by virtue of their dependency, as well as the additional subject matter recited therein.

In light of these remarks, it is submitted that claims 1-15 are allowable under both 35 U.S.C. §102 and 35 U.S.C. §103. Withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

#### Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of all the claims are respectfully solicited. In the event there are any errors with respect to the fees for this response or any other papers related to this response, the Director is hereby given permission to charge any shortages and credit any overcharges of any fees required for this submission to Deposit Account No. 14-1270.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brian S. Myers/

By: Brian Myers  
Registration No.: 46,947  
For: Mike Belk  
Registration No.: 33,357

**Mail all correspondence to:**

Mike Belk, Registration No. 33,357  
US PHILIPS CORPORATION  
P.O. Box 3001  
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001